

NOV. 22. 2006 4:05PM

MOFO 28TH FL

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 321 P. 4

Application No.: 10/652,750

NOV 22 2006
2

Docket No.: 249212022500

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-19 and 21-48 are pending in the application. No claims have been amended or canceled.

The advisory action maintains the rejection of Claims 35 and 41 under 35 USC 102(e) over Kim on the grounds that Kim discloses a "correlation filter having a transfer function based upon the transfer function of the bandpass filter," and that "a transfer function is a mathematical statement that relates (is a function of) a system input with its output. According to the advisory action, because the output of the bandpass filter is the input of the correlation filter, the transfer function of the correlation filter is based upon the transfer function of the bandpass filter.

On November 21, 2006, the undersigned held a telephone conference with the Examiner. The undersigned respectfully thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone call. During the conference, the undersigned reiterated that a transfer function describes the relationship between input and output. In particular, the transfer function of the correlation filter describes the relationship between the output of the correlation filter to the input of the correlation filter.

However, although the output response of the correlation filter in Kim may arguably be related to the transfer function of the bandpass filter, the transfer function of the correlation filter itself is not based upon the transfer function of the bandpass filter. Instead, Kim describes the bandpass filter and correlation filter transfer functions with different variables H_{BP} and H_{COR} , and does not teach or suggest that the correlation filter transfer function depends upon that of the bandpass filter. That is, as the undersigned explained during the telephone conference, the transfer function of the correlation filter in Kim appears fixed and invariant with respect to the input of the correlation filter, in this case the correlation filter input being related to the output of the bandpass filter. Because Kim does not disclose or suggest that the correlation filter transfer function is a function of its input (or of the output of the bandpass filter), the correlation filter transfer function is not a function of (and therefore not "based upon") the transfer function of the bandpass filter. Consequently, Kim does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 35 and 41.

sf-2230847

NOV. 22. 2006 4:05PM

MOFO 28TH FL

NO. 321 P. 5

Application No.: 10/652,750

3

Docket No.: 249212022500

Applicant incorporates herein the arguments made in the Response to Final Office Action with respect to the other rejections.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 249212022500. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert A. Saltzberg

Registration No.: 36,910

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

425 Market Street

San Francisco, California 94105-2482

(415) 268-6428

sf-2230847